

The Examiner rejected claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Chou* and *Vaughn* as applied to claims 1 and 3, and further in view of *Machii, et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,324,467).

## II. Response to Rejections

### A. Rejections to Claims 1-3 Under 35 U.S.C. §§ 112 and 103

Claims 1-3 have been cancelled.

### B. New Claims 4-36

Applicant respectfully submits that new independent claims 4, 17, and 29 are patentable over *Chou*, *Vaughn*, and *Machii, et al.* None of these references, nor their combination, teaches or suggests the following limitations as called for in claims 4, 17, and 29:

(a) receiving a request at a remote access server from a remote access device, wherein:

said request calls for geographic information and identifies data on a base device . . . operatively coupled for communication with said remote access server via a network;

(b) said remote access server obtaining said data from said base device; and

(c) providing said geographic information called for in said request, based at least in part on said data.

*Chou* teaches a smart mobile unit in an object receiving GPS satellite positioning data and transmitting a map-ready output to a central processing station for map generation and display processing. Authorized clients can then log onto the central processing station to view the object or multiple objects. *Chou*, col. 3, lns. 19-37.

*Chou* fails to provide any teaching of a request for geographic information that identifies base device data to be obtained and employed in providing the requested geographic information. *Chou* is also void of any teaching relating to the application of such a base device in providing geographic information. Figure 8 in *Chou* shows general purpose computer 800 connected to network 822. Nothing in *Chou* suggests that computer 800 or other networked entities, such as server 826 and host 823, satisfy the base device limitation of Applicant's claims. *Chou*, col. 8, lns. 27-29 and Fig. 8.

On page 3 of the March 26, 2002 Office Action, the Examiner asserts that host 823 in *Chou* satisfies Applicant's base device limitation. Applicant respectfully submits that this is not the case. *Chou* merely states that network 821 may provide a connection through local network 822 to computer 823. *Chou*, col. 9, lns. 19-26 and Fig. 8. *Chou* provides no teaching of computer 823, or any other device, operating as a base device — a device from which data identified in a remote request is obtained and employed as a basis for providing geographic information.

Applicant respectfully submits that *Vaughn* and *Machii, et al.* also fail to provide any teaching that relates to the employment of a base device, as called for in Applicant's claims. Neither of these references contains subject matter that can be combined together or combined with *Chou* to teach the above-cited claim limitations. This makes the combination of *Chou*, *Vaughn*, and *Machii, et al.* incapable of rendering Applicant's claims unpatentable. In fact, the Office Action is also devoid of any reference to *Vaughn* or *Machii, et al.* teaching subject matter related to the use of a base device.

Claims 5-16 depend ultimately from claim 4 and include all the limitations of claim 4 — making claims 5-16 patentable for at least the same reasons as set forth above for claim 4.

Claims 18-28 depend ultimately from claim 17 and include all the limitations of claim 17 — making claims 18-28 patentable for at least the same reasons as set forth above for claim 17.

Claims 30-36 depend ultimately from claim 29 and include all the limitations of claim 29 — making claims 30-36 patentable for at least the same reasons as set forth above for claim 29.

Applicant respectfully submits that claims 4-36 are patentable for at least the above-cited reasons.

### III. Additional Remarks

The references cited by the Examiner but not relied upon in the Office Action have been reviewed. It is believed that none of these references, either individually or in combination with other references, renders any of the claims unpatentable.

In view of the above Amendments and Remarks, Applicant requests consideration of new claims 4-36.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 501826 for any matter in connection with this document, including any fee for extension of time, which may be requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 23, 2002

By: William J. Harmon, III

William J. Harmon, III  
Reg. No. 40,635

VIERRA MAGEN MARCUS HARMON & DENIRO LLP  
685 Market Street, Suite 540  
San Francisco, California 94105  
Telephone: 415.369.9660  
Facsimile: 415.369.9665